

In The Drawings:

The “PRIOR ART” label is added in the newly submitted FIG. 3 and FIG. 4.

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office action mailed on March 16, 2009 and Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment dated October 23, 2009. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims 1-4 and 17-18 are respectfully requested.

Present Status of the Application

The Office objected drawings filed on Aug. 4, 2008. The Office objected to disclosure of the specification. The Office rejected claims 1-4, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office rejected claims 1-4, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Office rejected claims 1-4, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Furthermore, the Office rejected claims 1 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the processes, results in an improper definition of a process.

In response thereto, Applicants amend the drawings, specification, and claims to overcome the rejections and objections. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is respectfully requested.

To the Drawings

The Office objected drawings filed on Aug. 4, 2008, because FIG. 3 and FIG. 4 are prior art, and the label “PRIOR ART” should be added in FIG. 3 and FIG. 4.

In response thereto, the label “PRIOR ART” is added in the newly submitted FIG. 3 and FIG. 4, and acceptance of newly filed drawings is respectfully requested by Applicants.

To the Specification

The Office objected to disclosure of the specification because some informalities of grammar.

The Office stated the specification text on page 15, lines 2-4, “Once the power saving process signal has received and the length of the PSPP has obtained, the mechanism detects the upcoming least common multiple occurrence of the display-device blank periods in step 604...” has informalities of grammar, and suggested Applicants to correct these informalities.

In response thereto, Applicants amend the specification text on page 15, lines 2-4 as follows.

“Once the power saving process signal has been received and the length of the PSPP has been obtained, the mechanism detects the upcoming least common multiple occurrence of the display-device blank periods in step 604...”

Accordingly, the informalities of grammar are corrected, and acceptance of amended specification is respectfully requested by Applicants.

Discussion of Office Action Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st Paragraph

The Office rejected claims 1-4, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office rejected claims 1-4, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Regarding claims 1 and 17, the Office stated the features “all of the display devices do not indicate the graphics-processing unit to access the system memory through the memory controller during the non-responding period of the CPU” are not described in the specification, and therefore claims 1 and 17 are not enabled. However, Applicants do not agree and traverse the rejection under the following reasons.

In paragraph [0035] of the present invention, “During the PSPP, the CPU of the computer system idles to wait for a change of operating clock frequency, thereby **the CPU falling into a non-responding period, and blocking the memory access from a graphics-processing unit to a system memory.**”, it has described and taught all of the display devices do not indicate the graphics-processing unit to access the system memory through the memory controller during the non-responding period of the CPU since the memory access from a graphics-processing unit to a system memory is blocked during the CPU falls into the non-responding period.

To make claims 1 and 17 more definite, Applicants amends the features “all of the display devices do not indicate the graphics-processing unit to access the system memory through the memory controller during the non-responding period of the CPU” to “**memory access from**

the graphics-processing unit to the system memory through memory controller is blocked during the non-responding period of the CPU". Therefore, Applicants submit claims 1 and 17 are supported by and described in the specification of the present invention, and claims 1 and 17 meet the requirement of enablement. Accordingly, allowance of claims 1 and 17 is respectfully solicited.

Regarding claim 18, the Office stated the features "while executing the power saving process, the system memory is continuously accessed by the CPU during the non-responding period of the CPU" are not described in the specification of the present invention. However, Applicants do not agree and traverse the rejection under the following reasons.

In paragraph [0012] of the present invention, "The present invention provides four different image data display mechanisms for continuously displaying image/graphics data on multiple display devices computer system that contains **a system memory directly accessed by the computer's CPU during the non-responding period of the CPU.**" After the PSPP is executed, the CPU waits, and then falls into the non-responding period, and the system memory is directly accessed by the computer's CPU during the non-responding period of the CPU. Therefore, it has taught and disclosed that while executing the power saving process, the system memory is continuously accessed by the CPU during the non-responding period of the CPU. Therefore, Applicants submit claim 18 is supported by and described in the specification of the present invention, and claim 18 meets the requirement of enablement. Accordingly, allowance of claims 1 and 17 is respectfully solicited.

Claims 2-4 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph, because they depend on the rejected claim 1. However, based upon the foregoing reasons for traversing the rejections of claim 1, claim 1 are supported by the specification of the present invention, and therefore rejections of claims 2-4 are overcome.

Discussion of Office Action Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd Paragraph and 35 U.S.C.

101

The Office rejected claims 1-4, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Furthermore, the Office rejected claims 1 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the processes, results in an improper definition of a process.

Regarding claims 1 and 7, the Office stated the features “A graphic display method for continuously displaying a plurality of graphics data on multiple display devices of a computer system that contains a central processing unit which has a memory controller inside” are not definite and clear. The Office stated “the memory controller inside” means whether the memory controller is inside the computer system or the CPU.

In the specifications and drawings of the present invention, the controller is inside the CPU. Therefore, Applicants amend the features “A graphic display method for continuously displaying a plurality of graphics data on multiple display devices of a computer system that

contains a central processing unit which has a memory controller inside” to “A graphic display method for continuously displaying a plurality of graphics data on multiple display devices of a computer system that contains a central processing unit which has a memory controller inside **the CPU**”.

Regarding claims 1 and 17, the Office stated claim 1 provides for the use of the clock source, but since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending encompass. Claims 1 and 17 under 35 are thus rejected under U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the processes, results in an improper definition of a process.

In order to make claim 1 and 17 more definite and clear, Applicants amend the step “providing a common clock source to the display devices and using the common clock source to synchronize a plurality of blank periods of the display devices” to “providing a common clock source to the display devices and **synchronizing a plurality of blank periods of the display devices according to the common clock source**”. The amendment of step in claims 1 and 17 is supported by FIG. 6 and the relative description in paragraph [0035] of the present invention. When multiple display devices are connected to a computer system, they must co-operate by using the same clock source, and therefore the blank periods of the display devices must be synchronized according to the common clock source. Based upon the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit claims 1 and 17 meet the definition of a process of 35 U.S.C. 101, and allowance of claims 1 and 17 is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 1, the Office stated the limitation “reduce a power consumption of the CPU” lacks the insufficient antecedent basis. Applicants therefore amend the limitation “reduce a power consumption of the CPU” to “reduce consumptive_power of the CPU”. Accordingly, Applicants submit the limitation claim 1 has the insufficient antecedent basis, and allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Regarding claims 1 and 17, the Office stated the phrase “all of the display device do not indicate the graphics-processing unit to access the system memory through the memory controller during the non-responding period of the CPU” renders the claims indefinite.

Applicants have amended the phrase “all of the display device do not indicate the graphics-processing unit to access the system memory through the memory controller during the non-responding period of the CPU” to memory access from the graphics-processing unit to the system memory through memory controller is blocked during the non-responding period of the CPU”. Accordingly, Applicants submit claims 1 and 17 are definite, and allowance of claims 1 and 17 is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 2, the Office stated the limitation “the upcoming least common multiple occurrence” lacks the insufficient antecedent basis. Therefore, Applicants amend limitation “the upcoming least common multiple occurrence” to “an upcoming least common multiple occurrence”. Accordingly, the limitation “an upcoming least common multiple occurrence” has the insufficient antecedent basis.

Claims 3-4 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because they depend on the rejected independent claims. Based upon the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit the amended independent claims 1 and 17 overcome the 112 rejections, and their depend claims 3-4 and 18 are also allowable.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 101 and 112 rejections is accordingly solicited, and allowance for claims 1-4 and 17-18 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1-4 and 17-18 are in proper condition for allowance and an action to such an effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
J.C. PATENTS

Date: November 4, 2009

4 Venture, Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92618
Tel.: (949) 660-0761
Fax: (949)-660-0809
Email: jcpi@msn.com

/JIAWEI HUANG/
Jiawei Huang
Registration No. 43,330